REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1-33 were previously pending in this application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1-33 have been rejected. Accordingly, Claims 1-33 are currently pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Within the Office Action, claims 1-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,574,898 to Leblang et al. (hereinafter "Leblang"). The Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection.

Leblang teaches a dynamic software version auditor which monitors a process to provide a list of objects that are accessed. Leblang teaches using a configuration auditor which automatically produces configuration records, which provide documentation of software builds. [Leblang, col. 2, lines 24-27] It is taught within Leblang that each configuration record includes a listing of all source file versions that were used, version of build tools, and all build options that were specified. [Leblang, col. 2, lines 27-30] Leblang further teaches that the audit record can be stored along with the derived object to be used as historical information for the derived object. [Leblang, col. 2, lines 1-7] Leblang does not teach using this audit record to create the derived object. As discussed above, Leblang only teaches that the audit or configuration record is created to provide documentation of software builds, that is then used for historical or comparison purposes.

In contrast to the teachings of Leblang, the system and method for documenting composite data products of the present invention creates a state file to be associated with the process of the composite product to be created. The state file specifies a selected version of at least one selected data product to be used in creating the composite product. The state file is used to access the selected version of the selected product from the database. The composite product is created by including therein at least a portion of the selected version of the selected product. The system and method of the present invention also generates a state history file associated with the version of the composite product. The state history file indicates that at least a portion of the selected version of the selected product is included within the version of the composite product. As discussed above, Leblang does not teach a state file specifying a selected version of at least one selected data product to be used in creating the composite product.

Leblang only teaches that the audit or configuration record is created to provide documentation of software builds, that is then used for historical or comparison purposes. Leblang also does not teach generating a state history file associated with the version of the composite product, which indicates that at least a portion of the selected version of the selected product is included within the version of the composite product. It is taught within the present specification that the system and method is used with composite media products. Leblang teaches using the auditor with software builds.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to a process of documenting the contents of at least one version of a plurality of data products stored in a database, at least one of said products being a composite product having at least a portion of said data products included therein. The process of Claim 1 comprises creating a state file to be associated with a version of a composite product to be created, said state file specifying a selected version of at least one selected data product to be used in creating said composite product, using said state file to access said selected version of said selected product from the database, creating said version of said composite product by including therein at least a portion of said selected version of said selected product and generating a state history file associated with said version of said composite product, said state history file indicating that at least a portion of said selected version of said selected product is included within said version of said composite product. As discussed above, Leblang does not teach a state file specifying a selected version of at least one selected data product to be used in creating said composite product. Leblang only teaches that the audit or configuration record is created to provide documentation of software builds, that is then used for historical or comparison purposes. Further, Leblang does not teach generating a state history file associated with the version of the composite product, which indicates that at least a portion of the selected version of the selected product is included within the version of the composite product. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Leblang.

Claims 2-13 are all dependent on the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Leblang. Accordingly, the dependent Claims 2-13 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 14 is directed to a process of documenting the contents of at least one version of a plurality of data products stored in a database, at least one of said data products being a composite data product having at least a portion of said data products included therein. The process of Claim 14 comprises providing a user interface enabling a user to indicate a selected version of at least one selected data product to be used by a user in creating a composite

product, receiving user input indicating a selected version of at least one selected data product, creating a state file based on said selected version of said selected data product, said state file for specifying said selected version of said selected data product, using said state file to access said selected version of said selected product from the database, providing a user interface enabling a user to indicate that said version of said composite product has been created by including therein at least a portion of said selected version of said selected product, receiving user input indicating that said version of said composite product has been created and generating a state history file associated with said version of said composite product, said state history file indicating that at least a portion of said selected version of said selected product is included within said version of said composite product. As discussed above, Leblang does not teach a state file specifying a selected version of the selected data product and using the state file to access the selected version of the selected product from the database. Leblang only teaches that the audit or configuration record is created to provide documentation of software builds, that is then used for historical or comparison purposes. Further, Leblang does not teach generating a state history file associated with the version of the composite product, which indicates that at least a portion of the selected version of the selected product is included within the version of the composite product. Leblang also does not teach providing a user interface enabling a user to indicate a selected version of at least one selected data product to be used by a user in creating a composite product. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 14 is allowable over the teachings of Leblang.

Claims 15-19 are all dependent on the independent Claim 14. As discussed above, the independent Claim 14 is allowable over the teachings of Leblang. Accordingly, the dependent Claims 15-19 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 20 is directed to a system for documenting the contents of at least one version of a plurality of data products stored in a database, at least one of said products being a composite product having at least a portion of at least one of said data products included therein. The system of Claim 20 comprises means for creating a state file to be associated with a version of a composite product to be created, said state file specifying a selected version of at least one selected data product to be used in creating said composite product, means for using said state file to access said selected version of said selected product from the database, means for creating said version of said composite product by including therein at least a portion of said selected version of said selected product and means for generating a state history file associated with said version of said composite product, said state history file indicating that at least a portion of said selected version of said selected product is included within said version of said

composite product. As discussed above, Leblang does not teach means for creating a state file to be associated with a version of a composite product to be created, the state file specifying a selected version of at least one selected data product to be used in creating said composite product. Leblang only teaches that the audit or configuration record is created to provide documentation of software builds, that is then used for historical or comparison purposes. Further, Leblang does not teach means for generating a state history file associated with the version of the composite product, which indicates that at least a portion of the selected version of the selected product is included within the version of the composite product. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 20 is allowable over the teachings of Leblang.

The independent Claim 21 is directed to a machine readable storage device having stored therein encoding instructions for executing a process of documenting the contents of at least one version of a plurality of data products stored in a database, at least one of said data products being a composite data product having at least a portion of at least one of said data products included therein. The machine readable storage device of Claim 21 comprises creating a state file to be associated with a version of a composite product to be created, said state file specifying a selected version of at least one selected data product to be used in creating said composite product, using said state file to access said selected version of said selected product from the database, creating said version of said composite product by including therein at least a portion of said selected version of said selected product and generating a state history file associated with said version of said composite product, said state history file indicating that at least a portion of said selected version of said selected product is included within said version of said composite product. As discussed above, Leblang does not teach a state file specifying a selected version of at least one selected data product to be used in creating said composite product. Leblang only teaches that the audit or configuration record is created to provide documentation of software builds, that is then used for historical or comparison purposes. Further, Leblang does not teach generating a state history file associated with the version of the composite product, which indicates that at least a portion of the selected version of the selected product is included within the version of the composite product. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 21 is allowable over the teachings of Leblang.

Claims 22-33 are all dependent on the independent Claim 21. As discussed above, the independent Claim 21 is allowable over the teachings of Leblang. Accordingly, the dependent Claims 22-33 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

For the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be greatly appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: _May 6, 2004_

By: _____
Jonathan O. Owens
Reg. No. 37,902

Attorneys for Applicants

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR§ 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Date: 5/6/04   By: _____